

calculation of the power required for maintaining a given driving speed pattern, as taught at column 7, line 66 to column 9, line 43, a battery charging/discharging schedule, i.e., "operating schedule of the motor and the engine in the route to the destination" (column 7, line 66 to column 8, line 3) is determined. At column 5, lines 13-43 referred to by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Kuroda et al. are simply teaching one method of such scheduling for a given driving speed pattern. Contrary to the Examiners' assertion, at column 5, lines 13-43 of Kuroda et al there is no mention or suggestion of plural driving speed patterns for a given section of route. Nor is there mention or suggestion of such a feature elsewhere in Kuroda et al.

Thus, in Kuroda et al., because each of the plural driving speed patterns is for a unique route section, each of these plural driving speed patterns is necessarily involved in the afore-mentioned scheduling. Accordingly, the generation of plural driving speed patterns for "extracting" or selecting, in accordance with the present invention, is completely foreign to the teachings of Kuroda et al. Indeed, selection as between the driving speed patterns for different road sections in Kuroda et al, based on "at least date-and-time and weather information," would have been nonsensical. In the invention of Kuroda et al., the driving speed pattern utilized at any given point on the route is necessarily dictated by the geographical location of the vehicle. For example, if the route determined for travel to a given destination were to be divided into sections 1-5, the scheduling for a vehicle traveling in section 1 would necessarily be determined in accordance with the single driving speed pattern for section 1. For travel in section 1, selection and utilization of a driving speed pattern for a route section other than that for section 1, the driving pattern for section for section 2 for example, in accordance with

"at least date-and-time and weather information," would be completely inappropriate and alien to any concept suggested by Kuroda et al.

The additional teachings of the newly cited Kolls patent in no way suggest any modification of Kuroda which would be relevant here. The undersigned has carefully reviewed each of the four teachings of Kolls cited by the Examiner. Three of these teachings simply describe apparatus for forewarning travelers of changing weather conditions or conditions likely to be encountered in travel ahead. In the teaching at column 19, lines 17-25 Kolls suggests an embodiment wherein such conditions would be graphically depicted to show change over time, distance traveled, etc. Nowhere does Kolls suggest utilization of such information for "scheduling" of operation of a hybrid vehicle in the context of Kuroda et al. Further removed from anything suggested by Kolls, is utilization of such information in selecting one of plural traveling speed patterns.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of record in light of the foregoing comments.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC


By: George A. Loud
Registration No. 25,814

Date: December 9, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500